IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6575 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

MANISH RAMESHBHAI PATEL

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 6575 of 2002

MS BHARTI H RANA for Petitioner No. 1

MR IM PANDYA, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 25/10/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

By means of filing this petition, the petitioner has challenged the order of detention dated 6-6-2002 passed by the Police Commissioner, Rajkot City, and he

has been branded as a dangerous person.

2. It is a settled principle of law that in order to bring a person within the expression "dangerous person" as defined in clause (c) of section 2 of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (for short `the Act of 1985'), there should be positive materials to indicate that such person is habitual of committing or attempting to commit or abetting the commission of offences which are punishable under Chapter XVI or XVII of Chapter V of the Arms Act and that single or isolated act falling under the said Chapters cannot be characterised as a habitual acts as envisaged in section 2(c) of the PASA Act. Further, besides a person being a dangerous person, his activities should also fall within the ambit of expression `public order'. A distinction has to be drawn between the `law and order' and `maintenance of public order'. A reference may be made of M.J.Shaikh V. M.M. Mehta, Commissioner of Police & Ors., reported in 1995 (2) GLR 1268.

3. Learned advocate for the petitioner has submitted that two offences have been registered against the detenu. Drawing my attention towards page 15 of the compilation, she has contended that at the time of passing the impugned order of detention, detenu was in judicial custody which aspect ought to have been considered by the detailing authority. She has drawn my attention towards the case of Amritlal and Others Vs. Union Govt. Through Secy., Ministry of Finance and Others, 2001 SCC (Cri) 147 wherein it was held at Head note as under:

> "Preventive Detention--Detention order-Subjective satisfaction--Detenu already in jail-Detaining authority must be satisfied on the basis of available cogent material about likelihood of the detenu being released on bail and not merely about likelihood of his moving application for bail--In absence of such satisfaction detention order cannot be sustained--Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic drugs and Psychotropic Substances act, 1988, S.3(1)"

He has submitted that a co-accused has been released by this Court while passing the order dated 25-10-2002 in Special Civil Application No.7139 of 2002 and hence, petitioner also be released.

4. It seems that there is non-application of mind on the part of detaining authority as detenu was in judicial

custody when the impugned order of detention was passed and hence, in view of the judgment rendered in Amritlal (supra), the continued detention of the detenu is illegal and the same cannot be sustained. Since a co-accused has been released by this Court, petitioner is entitled to be released on the ground of parity.

5. The petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 6-6-2002 passed against the detenu Manish Rameshbhai Patel is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly with no order as to costs. Direct service is permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

radhan/